



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SU

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/162,735 09/29/98 GESSNER

R 013.0072

TM02/0720
ERIK B CHERDAK & ASSOCIATES LLC.
11300 ROCKVILLE PIKE
SUITE 906
ROCKVILLE MD 20852

EXAMINER

PAULA, C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED:

07/20/01

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

SU
1- File Copy

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/162,735

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Applicant(s)

GESSNER, RICK

Art Unit

2176

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 July 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____
5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
- Claim(s) allowed: _____
- Claim(s) objected to: _____
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____
9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
11. ☐ Other: _____


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 6. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1, 7, and 13, and in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "Hsu patent is completely silent and is not directed in any way to processing textual and other similar rendering or layout source documents" (p.3,L.26-28) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's assertion that the basis for obviousness is resting on a "completely deficient patent" (p.4,L.9-12), because although, Hsu fails to explicitly teach a scanner to access an input content stream, a parsing component coupled to a scanner component, and a replaceable document type definition. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have provided the scanner for the reception of the input document to be transformed into proper SGML syntax, parsed the content for providing corrected SGML syntax, and to have had a replaceable document component to be replace during execution of the client to have replaced the erroneous syntax with the corrected one as taught by Hsu (c.2,L.15-22, c.5,L.32-67, and c.6,L.1-9).